Existence Is Infinite (2025)

Oct 1
91 / 198
Dec 15
2d ago

futureone 6d

> Kallikantzaros:
>
> There are no atoms - no indivisible, immutable things, other than in organic brains. Organic brains must reduce flux, interactivity, to a level it can process.
>
> Atoms vanish in a haze of interacting energies if we look at them using powerful electron devices.

If u put 1 atom in a box it is a probability cloud, a haze, putting a sampler in the box will likely not do anything and only until the atom is detected (which is less than a 1% chance).

Once you combine 12 or so atoms in a chain then they begin to exist classically, like a physical object.

I still don’t know what an atom is though. I believe quantum physics may be on to something though. The way electrons are around an atom seems to be some kind of wave function. Electrons appear to be waves, vibrations, etc. The part I do not understand is what kind of wave stays in one place, and what the nucleus is and why it seems constrained to the nucleus. Waves are usually moving outward, like an ocean wave, not staying in one place, unless they are in a container to constrain the wave, but there is no container around an atom.

2 Replies

Jupiter123 abc1231 6d

Give up futureone you are wasting your time.

Philosophy;Science is simple to understand.

---

daniel j lavender 6d

> Silenus:
>
> > daniel_j_lavender:
> >
> > This is a rather ambiguous answer. You haven’t provided a clear definition. What is “work”? What is “creating”?
>
> Energy…..is not a thing.

Energy is a word, a term, a concept of human understanding. By definition a thing.

> Silenus:
>
> Energy is creating.

You claim energy is all while claiming energy is creating. So is energy *not* non-creating? Is energy *not* destruction? In which case, your assertion that “energy is all” would be false.

You would have to assert destruction does not exist, you would have to deny a common conception of human perception to present that statement with any confidence.

> Silenus:
>
> Energy and existence mean the same thing…a state…..not a thing.

A state by definition is *a* thing.

Energy and existence are synonymous, however, existence is comprehensive while energy is not.

Existence concerns both part *and* whole. Of any subject.

Energy is a relatively narrow term employed primarily in physics and science. You must awkwardly force the term upon every thing, in the process rejecting common conceptions like destruction and emptiness, to make your assertion work.

> Silenus:
>
> > daniel_j_lavender:
> >
> > How does silence fit within “at work in the process of creating”? How does emptiness fit within “at work in the process of creating”?
>
> Science deals with energy patterns. Energies that are perceptible, predictable, useful.

Silence, not science. Slow down. Take your time. Read the statements carefully. This is not a race.

> Silenus:
>
> > daniel_j_lavender:
> >
> > Are thoughts, are concepts themselves energy or are they *emergent* from such interaction?
>
> Yes, thoughts are neural pulses triggering neural clusters….

Neural pulses are neural pulses. Thoughts are thoughts. The latter could be said to *emerge* from the former.

However with your forced terminology there is no subtlety, there is no distinction. There is no special significance to the phenomena.

> Silenus:
>
> > daniel_j_lavender:
> >
> > How does either definition of energy you’ve provided resolve such a situation? I contend neither does.
>
> There is no void….no emptiness…even space has a temperature.
>
> Nothingness is a human concept that takes the perceptible and inverts it…

Emptiness is not the same as nothingness. Nothingness is not and cannot be. This is thoroughly explained in the essay.

Your statement:

> Silenus:
>
> All is energy.

…reads like something Deepak Chopra would write.

Your concept of energy is not comprehensive.

You define energy as “interactive”. However existence, being all things, being the whole or entirety, would not be interactive. It would be all things. No other would be beyond to interact to render it interactive. It would simply be.

Your concept, energy as all, energy as interactive, does not accommodate this.

The ontology and term I’m presenting, existence as all, existence as both part and whole, does.

Existence is infinite. Existence simply is. This is logically interlinked and illustrated with this previous statement:

> daniel j lavender:
>
> **Existence is infinite**, existence is not limited. Existence is not limited to any particular, existence is all. There is no cause or reason beyond existence as any cause or reason would be existence. Thus, **existence just is**.

5 Replies